

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *BORIOMYIA* BANKS,  
1905. Z.N.(S.) 1531  
(see volume 20, pages 305-306)

By F. M. Carpenter (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.)

Although the basic chronology has been correctly set forth by Mr. Kimmings in his first four paragraphs, his fifth, sixth and seventh paragraphs require some clarification. The following comments are directed to these paragraphs:

(1) Mr. Kimmings states that the application of the Rules has led to the "adoption of an interpretation of the generic name *Boriomyia* Banks contrary to the original intention of the author". In support of this, Mr. Kimmings quotes from my revision of the Hemerobiidae (1940) in which I reported that Mr. Banks had told me (1940) that the sequence of publication of his two papers (1904, 1905) was the reverse of the sequence which he expected. I included this statement in my 1940 revision because Mr. Banks felt he should explain why he did not designate a type-species of *Boriomyia* in his 1904 paper. I feel that I should now add that, in the same conversation, Mr. Banks further stated that he was nevertheless in complete agreement with Mr. Killington's treatment of *Boriomyia* (1937, p. 253) and he admonished me to follow Killington in my revision, i.e., using *Boriomyia* in its 1904 sense.

Quite apart from Mr. Banks' opinion, it is not his intentions which should determine the validity of the name, but the actual record of publication. If we are to inject the highly subjective factor of intention in our nomenclature, we might as well dispense with all rules.

(2) Mr. Kimmings states in paragraph 6 that although Killington's action is justified under the Rules, his generic name *Kimmensisia* has not been universally adopted. I consider this statement misleading. A survey of the literature on *Boriomyia* and *Kimmensisia* subsequent to 1937 (when Killington called attention to the confusion over the type-species of *Boriomyia*) shows that the names *Kimmensisia* and *Boriomyia* have been used in the 1904 sense (i.e., Killington's) by Carpenter (1940), Eglin (1940), Fraser (1940, 1942, 1951, 1953, 1959), Friedrich (1953), Kimmings (1952), MacLeod (1960), Meinander (1963), Nakahara (1956, 1960) and Parfin (1956). In fact, so far as I am aware, Mr. Tjeder has been the only one, in all the years since 1937, who has adhered to the use of *Boriomyia* Banks (*sensu* 1905)! The only exception to that statement is Zelený (1963), who has made it clear (*in. litt.*) that he arbitrarily followed Tjeder, without investigating the history of the case.

(3) Mr. Kimmings proposes in paragraph 7 that "stability in nomenclature in this case be attained by suppressing the generic name *Boriomyia* Banks, 1904, and by placing *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905, on the official list of generic names". As a matter of fact, stability could better be attained by retaining the name *Boriomyia* Banks, 1904, with *fidelis* Banks as the type-species; since this is in accordance with the Rules and in accordance with actual usage, except for Mr. Tjeder.

(4) The introduction of the question of whether or not *Wesmaelius* Krüger, 1922, and *Kimmensisia* Killington, 1937 (= *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905) are congeneric is entirely irrelevant to the proposal to validate *Boriomyia* Banks, 1904. This synonymy, suggested by Tjeder, is entirely a matter of his opinion, which I do not share. If *Wesmaelius* and *Kimmensisia* are congeneric, there are no problems involving *Boriomyia*, since *Wesmaelius* is available for the genus for which *Kimmensisia* was established.

From a consideration of all the facts involved in this case, I believe Mr. Kimmings' proposal should be rejected.